

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-24 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 20 is amended, and claims 23-24 are added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement and corresponding form PTO-1449 for the application on May 30, 2003. The Examiner is requested to forward an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 evidencing that the cited prior art references have been considered by the Examiner, to Applicant along with the next Office Action.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 3-5 and 10-14 would be allowable should the double-patenting rejection be overcome. Claims 3-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-9 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 09/721,708. U.S. Application No. 09/721,708 has been abandoned. A copy of the Notice of Abandonment is attached for the Examiner's convenience. Accordingly, claims 3-5 and 10-14 should be in condition for allowance. Further, the provisional rejection of claims 6-9 should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 9, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Asano et al. (hereinafter "Asano"), U.S. Patent No. 6,353,288. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Asano discloses a plasma display panel, as shown in Figure 4, including sustain electrodes 5, a dielectric layer 6, and a protective layer 7. Asano does not disclose or suggest forming the protective layer only on the display region, as recited in independent claim 9, or forming the protective layer on an upper substrate only in the display region, as recited in independent claim 20. Rather, the protective layer 7 extends the full length of and fully covers the dielectric layer 6, as shown in Figure 4. There is no disclosure in Asano that the protective layer is limited to only the display region. As can be seen in Figure 4, the protective layer extends beyond the edges of ribs 9 and thus beyond the display region of the panel.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 9 and 20 as being anticipated by Asano, should be withdrawn. Dependent claim 21 is allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 20, from which it depends, as well as for its added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 6-8 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuko et al. (hereinafter "Masuko"), U.S. Patent No. 6,337,028, in view of Inoue, U.S. Patent No. 6,275,273. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action argues that Masuko discloses all of the claimed features of independent claims 6 and 15 except "a non-display region provided with black matrices." The Office Action then applies Inoue which allegedly "discloses the use of a black matrix on the entire plasma display panel (column 30-31, lines 67+; column 48, lines 29+), which includes a non-display portion." The Office Action then concludes that "[o]ne of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the plasma display

panel disclosed by Masuko with that of Inoue because by using the black matrix in the non-display portion of the panel the black matrix becomes part of the protective film" and "[t]herefore, the overall reliability of the panel is improved (column 31, lines 4+)."

However, the black matrix formed in the non-display region or area of the claimed invention is provided to shut out light caused by discharge in the non-display region. Inoue does not disclose or suggest such features. Rather, Inoue only discloses that the black matrix is formed to cover the sealed section, the entire panel, or the built-in driver section. The black matrix of Inoue is not configured to shut out light caused by discharge in a non-display region or area. Accordingly, there would have been no motivation to combine the plasma display panel disclosed by Masuko in view of the teachings of Inoue to produce the claimed invention. Thus, the rejection of independent claims 6 and 15 over the combination of Masuko and Inoue should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 7-8 and 16-19, as well as added claims 23-24, are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 6 and 15, from which they depend, respectively, as well as for their added features.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carol L. Druzbeck, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/717,284

Docket No. YHK-057

Reply to Office Action dated May 22, 2003

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Carol L. Druzick  
Registration No. 40,287

Attachment: Copy of Notice of Abandonment  
for USSN 09/721,708

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

703 502-9440 DYK:CLD/kam

Date: October 22, 2003

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**